U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

c/o DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL

AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON D.C. 20535

DEAR SIR,

ON DECEMBER 10, 1984 I SENT TO THE FBI THE ENCLOSED TWO DOCUMENTS, P575 OF THE WARREN REPORT AND THE FBI'S VERSION OF THE SAME ISSUE, VOL. 25, P859, (PUBLISHED IN THE WARREN COMMISSION'S 26 VOLUMES). THE TWO REPORTS CREATE A CONTRADICTION.

WHILE THE COMMISSION COULD NOT DETERMINE IF OSWALD'S POST OFFICE APPLICATION LISTED A. HIDELL AS ONE ENTITLED TO RECEIVE MAIL AT THE BOX, THE FBI STATED THAT OSWALD DID NOT INDICATE ON HIS APPLICATION THAT OTHERS, INCLUDING AN A. HIDELL, WOULD RECEIVE MAIL THROUGH THE P.O. BOX IN QUESTION. I ASKED FOR AN EXPLANATION

ON JANUARY 10, 1985 WILLIAM M. BAKER, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS, SENT THE ENCLOSED RESPONSE WHICH STATED NO DOCUMENTATION "AT THIS TIME" COULD BE LOCATED TO EXPLAIN THE FBI STATEMENT AND RESULTING CONTRADICTION. MR. BAKER CONCURRED WITH THE WARREN COMMISSION'S FINDING "INASMUCH AS A PERTINENT PORTION OF THE APPLICATION HAD SINCE

BEEN DISCARDED."

WHILE I WAS GRATEFUL FOR MR. BAKER'S RESPONSE, HIS EXPLANATION, HOWEVER, DID NOT RESOLVE THE CONTRADICTION AT HAND.

ON NOV. 18, 1985 A CITIZEN NAMED PAUL CASSIDY WROTE TO THE FBI ABOUT THE SAME ISSUE. ON JAN. 7, 1986 MR. JAMES K. HALL, THE CHIEF OF THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION — PRIVACY ACTS SECTION, RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION SENT 23 PAGES PERTAINING TO THE P.O. BOX ISSUE TO MR. CASSIDY. NOT ONLY DID MR. HALL AVOID THE ISSUE MR. CASSIDY WAS TRYING TO RESOLVE, BUT ONE OF THE 23 PAGES, A MEMO DATED 11/25/63 FROM W. D. GRIFFITH TO MR. CONRAD, REAFFIRMS THE FBI'S POSITION STATED IN VOLUME 25.

ON JULY 3, 1986 AN ASSOCIATE OF PAUL CASSIDY'S NAMED TIMOTHY CWIEK WROTE TO THE FBI (MR. HALL'S POSITION, SPECIFICALLY), FOR FURTHER CLARIFICATION OF THE SITUATION/ CONTRADICTIONS.

ON AUGUST 26, 1986 MR. BAKER RESPONDED TO MR. CWIEK, WHICH IS ENCLOSED. MR. BAKER STATES THAT THE APPLICATION THAT THE FBI EXAMINED WAS "A CARD".

WHEN ALL OF THE ABOVE CORRESPONDENCE REACHED ME, I WAS INTRIGUED, BUT CONFUSED. WHILE I REALIZE THAT THE FBI IS NOT REQUIRED TO GIVE EXPLANATIONS, I THINK IT IS TO EVERYONE'S BENEFIT TO CLARIFY THE SITUATION AS BEST AS POSSIBLE FOR HISTORY'S SAKE.

MR. BAKER WROTE, "ANY INTERPRETATION OF OUR REPORT SHOULD BE LIMITED TO OUR WORK REGARDING THE APPLICATION CARD."

FRANKLY, I DO NOT WANT TO "INTERPRET" ANYTHING SINCE TO DO SO MAY LEAD TO FALSE ASSUMPTIONS.

FIRST, THROUGH THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT, I REQUEST A COPY OF THE APPLICATION CARD CITED BY W. D. GRIFFITH AND SUBSEQUENTLY, MR. BAKER.

SECONDLY, COULD YOU EXPLAIN THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THIS "CARD" AND OSWALD'S POST OFFICE APPLICATION? WAS IT NORMAL PRACTICE TO HAVE THIS INFORMATION ON A CARD AS WELL AS THE APPLICATION? PERHAPS AN EXPLANATION OF THIS CARD COULD RESOLVE SOME OF THE CONFUSION.

FINALLY, IF POSSIBLE, I WOULD LIKE TO CONTACT W. D. GRIFFITH WHO

IS THE BEST SOURCE FOR RESOLUTION.

WHILE I REALIZE YOU CANNOT OFFER ME HIS ADDRESS, COULD YOU GIVE ME THE ADDRESS FOR THE FBI RETIRED AGENTS' ORGANIZATION? ALSO COULD I FORWARD A PACKAGE, THROUGH YOU, TO MR. D. GRIFFITH SO THAT HE COULD DETERMINE FOR HIMSELF WHETHER TO CONTACT ME?

I WOULD GREATLY APPRECIATE YOUR COOPERATION AND HOPE TO HEAR FROM YOU SOON.

SINCERELY,

Edgar F. Tatro

EDGAR F. TATRO
51 EDGEMONT RD.
BRAINTREE, MASS 02184

P.S. ON JANUARY 10, 1985 MR. BAKER TOLD ME THAT THE SITUATION COULD NOT BE RESOLVED DUE TO LACK OF DOCUMENTATION "AT THIS TIME". PERHAPS SOME DOCUMENTATION, EIGHT YEARS LATER, COULD BE LOCATED. IF SO, I REQUEST COPIES OF ALL OF SAID DOCUMENTATION THROUGH THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND PATIENCE